

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/812,912	Applicant(s) BLANCHE ET AL.	
	Examiner Brian Whiteman	Art Unit 1635	

All Participants:

(1) Brian Whiteman.

(2) Jessica Roark.

Date of Interview: 27 June 2006

Status of Application: 2nd non-final

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: N/A

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
102(e)

Claims discussed:
10-19

Prior art documents discussed:
n/a

Part II.


SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

BRIAN WHITEMAN
PATENT EXAMINER


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner notified applicant's representative that the Declarations under 1.131 list the incorrect application. The application no. will be crossed out and the correct application no. will be inserted by the examiner. Applicant's representative noted that ~~the~~ in the argument section of the response, the applicant admitted that they were using the Declarations from the parent application. In view of compact prosecution, the examiner will consider the Declarations against the 102(e) in the instant application.